



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,498	08/01/2001	Klein Rodrigues	1943.ALC	7118

7590

02/27/2003

Thomas F. Roland
NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL COMPANY
10 Findeme Avenue
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0500

EXAMINER

TARAZANO, DONALD LAWRENCE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS3

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,498

Applicant(s)

RODRIGUES ET AL.

Examiner

D. Lawrence Tarazano

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

File

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 9 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims do not end in a period; they are not complete sentences. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-10 and 12- 18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 09/690,387. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the "hydrophilic" monomer of the instant application can be an acid monomer, which is neutralized with a base (claims 7-9). This corresponds to the "hydrophilic base-neutralizable" monomer cited in the first claim of the 09/690,387.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1773

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

5. Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Diel et al. (6,337,379).

6. Diel et al. teach a latex binder comprising hydrophobic monomers (styrene), hydrophilic acidic monomers (itaconic acid, acrylic acid), water, and a surfactant (column 3, lines 29+ and the example). The latex is neutralized with bases such as sodium hydroxide as claimed. The materials are applied to a fiber mat (a textile application) in which solids concentrations of 15-45% are used (column 3, lines 1+). The applicants state that their materials are not cross-linked. While the materials taught by Diel et al. are cross-linked this is done after the materials are dried at a lower temperature (212 deg F) (example). The intermediate (un-cured) product would correspond to the claimed materials.

The applicants claim a number of physical properties such as clarity, solubility in basic or acid media etc... The examiner takes the position that the monomer used would yield clear base soluble materials based on the monomers used because they correspond to the types of materials used by the applicants in the instant application.

Regarding claim 16, the fiber web formed is used in personal hygiene products so the materials do get wet. In this instance, the web would be water-resistant, as it would resist falling apart when placed in contact with water.

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schoenberg et al (6,150,468) with additional evidence provided by Westerman (6,488,764) if deemed necessary.

8. Schoenberg et al. teach emulsions comprising "star polymers" made from butyl acrylate (a hydrophobic monomer according to applicants' specification page 6) and acrylic monomers (a hydrophilic monomer). See Example III: The compositions comprise 10% solids, are clear and comprise: ethanol, which would function as an "anti-microbial agent" (claim 5) and sodium hydroxide.

9. The star polymer is also incorporated into a second composition (see column 7, lines 26+ and Examples 8 and 9), which is used as a laminating adhesive. See Westerman column 6, lines 67+, which shows that the Aerosol TM material used in Examples VIII and IX is a surfactant as claimed.

10. Both the intermediate product (star polymer) and the final product (polymer composition comprising the star polymer) read on the applicants' composition.

11. Regarding claims 17-20, the materials taught are used as "coating" and "adhesives" which gives clear indication that the materials are used in multilayer structures, and they are used as sizes in "textile applications" (column 8, lines 46+). This is described with sufficient specificity to meet the applicants' claims directed to "coated articles" and "method of using the composition".

Art Unit: 1773

12. Claims 1-10, 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kneip et al. (6,200,640).

13. Kneip et al. teach polymeric dispersions used to tan leather (claims). The materials comprise a tanning agent (preservative) and are neutralized with a base such as sodium hydroxide (column 8, lines 41+). The solutions have solids contents within the preferred range of 20 to 60% (column 8, lines 58-60).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Lawrence Tarazano whose telephone number is (703)-308-2379. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6:00 (off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J Thibodeau can be reached on (703)-309-2367. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-872-9310 for regular communications and (703)-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-308-0661.

D. Lawrence Tarazano
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773



dlt
February 24, 2003